

## REMARKS

The Applicant has received and reviewed the Office Action dated February 14, 2006 wherein the Office rejected claims 1-2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the reference of Richards (U.S. Patent No. 3,911,988); further rejected claim 1 on the grounds of nonstatutory double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,944; and rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of the references of Richards and Maldonado et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,293,297). The Office also objected to claims 5-11 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated that claims 5-11:

“... would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” (Page 4, paragraph 6 of the Office Action)

In view of the Office’s above comments and in order to place the application in a condition for allowance, the Applicant has canceled dependent claims 2-5 and amended independent claim 1 to include the subject matter of dependent claim 5, which the Office on page 4, paragraph 6 of the Office Action indicated contains allowable subject matter.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Allowance of claims 1 and 6-11, as amended, is respectfully requested. Applicant has enclosed a version of the amendment showing changes made with this response. Please charge any deficit in fees to deposit account 10-0210.